

REMARKS

Claims 1-129 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-129 stand rejected.

Claims 2, 98, 109 and 110 have been objected to.

Claims 2, 17, 50, 96-98, and 105 have been amended.

Specification Objection

The Abstract has been objected to. The Abstract has been amended in response to the objection. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner.

The Status Identifier for claims 98, 109, and 110 has been changed to “(Previously Presented)”.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 105-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite for lacking antecedent basis for the phrase “the usage conditions”.

Claim 105 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for “the usage conditions”.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

I.

Claims 1-97, 110, 114, 119, 123, 128-129 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Kusterer et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. US2005/0076311A1 (referred to herein as (“*Kusterer*”).

Kusterer relates to “Systems and techniques to provide a unifying navigation model with a navigation service that provides an interface to information sources.” *Kusterer*, Abstract.

Claims 1, 80, 110, and 119.

Claims 1, 80, 110, and 119 recite “combining a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications into composite user interface data.” *Kusterer* teaches that “Using the portal platform, a wide range of applications can be displayed in a single page in a browser.” *Kusterer*, ¶0054. *Kusterer* further teaches that “The portal 320 provides a common interface to applications 340.” *Id.*, ¶0040. However, *Kusterer* neither teaches nor suggests that the “common interface” is a combination of “a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications.” Claims 1, 80, 110, and 119

In the Response to Arguments, p. 31 of the January 6, 2011 Office Action, the Examiner states that “the portal presentation 500 [of *Kusterer* Fig. 5] at a given point in time can be interpreted as a “composite user interface data” generated from combining a subset of the plurality of user interface elements, e.g., only a subset of pages, from the source applications.” Applicants respectfully disagree. Fig. 5 of *Kusterer* depicts a “Navigation iView 1”, a “Navigation iView 2”, a “Navigation iView 3”, and a “Target Page”. *Kusterer* teaches:

In one aspect, a technique, which can be implemented in a software product, involves uniting navigation hierarchies from different application sources by supplying a navigation service with a navigation object model that provides, to a presentation layer, a homogeneous view of navigation information from the different application sources. A unified navigation area can then be provided based on the united navigation hierarchy. ¶0006.

Providing the unified navigation area can involve displaying a navigation window in a portal presentation, where the navigation window includes navigation links to resources

of the different application sources, and where the navigation links are organized according to the unified navigation hierarchy. ¶0007.

The portal layout presentation 500 can include various user interfaces, such as menu bars and favorites links, both in the main window level and in the sub-windows used to present application information. ¶0054.

FIG. 7 illustrates an example page in a Web-based portal presentation 700. The portal presentation 700 can be a standard Web browser window and can include a menu bar 710. The portal presentation 700 also includes navigation areas. A top level navigation area 720 provides role-based and user-based options for a current user. Navigation areas 730, 740, 750 provide a simple point and click user interface to the unified navigation hierarchy. ¶0059.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the portal presentations taught by *Kusterer* include navigation areas, which are not “user interface elements from the source applications” as required by claims 1, 80, 110, and 119. The only user interface element taught by *Kusterer* that is arguably from a source application is the “Target Page”. However, a single “Target Page” is not and does not teach “combining a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications into composite user interface data” as required by claims 1, 80, 110, and 119.

Accordingly, *Kusterer* does not anticipate claims 1, 80, 110, or 119 or claims dependent thereon.

Claim 17.

Regarding claim 17, *Kusterer* does not teach “modelling relationships between the at least part of the user interfaces provided by the source applications and the composite user interface” with the “composite user interface comprising a plurality of user interface elements provided by [the] plurality of source applications” as required by claim 17. Thus, the “user interfaces” in claim 17 are provided by a plurality of source applications.

As discussed with regard to claims 1, 80, 110, and 119, the interface taught by *Kusterer* is from at most one source application, e.g. the only user interface element taught by *Kusterer* that is arguably from a source application is the “Target Page” of Fig. 5. The balance of the user interface is navigation windows, which are clearly not “at least part of the user interfaces”

provided by the source applications” as required by claim 17. Thus, *Kusterer* does not teach “modelling relationships between the at least part of the user interfaces provided by the source applications and the composite user interface” as required by claim 17.

Furthermore, *Kusterer* teaches that “According to one aspect, these systems and techniques involve uniting navigation hierarchies from different application sources, and providing a unified navigation area based on the united navigation hierarchy. *Kusterer*, ¶0004. “Uniting the navigation hierarchies can involve accepting connectors for the different application sources, and receiving the navigation information from the different application sources through the connectors according to the navigation object model.” *Id.*, ¶0006. *Kusterer* explains that “A navigation service is supplied with a navigation object model that provides a homogenous view of navigation information from different application sources at 100.” *Id.* ¶0024. “The navigation service can store navigation information in the form of navigation nodes 220, 224 in a data structure representing a united navigation hierarchy.” *Id.*, ¶0030. “A navigation node can include the following properties: Children, Related nodes, Title, LaunchURL, Visualization, ShowExternal, and Window Size.” *Id.*, ¶0031. Thus, the navigation service and navigation hierarchies are not “modelling relationships between the at least part of the user interface provided by the source application **and** the composite user interface” as required by claim 17. Accordingly, *Kusterer* does not anticipate claim 17 or claims dependent thereon.

Claim 50.

Claim 50 recites “generating model data representing a model of relationships between at least part of the user interfaces provided by the source applications and the composite user interface.” Accordingly, for at least reasons similar to claim 17, *Kusterer* does not anticipate claim 50 or claims dependent thereon.

Claim 96.

Claim 96 recites “A computer apparatus for generating a composite user interface for communication with a plurality of source applications” and “generating model data representing a model of said composite user interface in response to user input, wherein the composite user interface comprises a plurality of user interface elements provided by the source applications.”

As discussed with reference to claims 1 and 17, the navigation hierarchy and navigation services provide navigation information and are not “model data representing a model of said composite user interface wherein the composite user interface comprises a plurality of user interface elements provided by the source applications.” Accordingly, *Kusterer* does not anticipate claim 96.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II.

Claims 98-100, 102-107, 109-111, 114, 118-120, 123, and 127-129 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Gangopadhyay U.S. Patent Publication No. US2002/0184402 (referred to herein as (“*Gangopadhyay*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 98 and 105 recite “modifying said composite user interface by changing a number of the user interface elements for display by a user computer system in accordance with the usage conditions” “wherein the usage conditions include demand for information and response time for providing the demanded information.” Referring to para. 0031 and Table 2 of *Gangopadhyay*, *Gangopadhyay* teaches that “When a user selects an Event Entry (say the one at 06:29), only the services, relevant to the act of flying out are shown. If the user selects an associated service (say Check Flight Status), the information from the Event Entry is used as a context to supply input data (Airline and Flight Number) to the service.”

Thus, the usage condition in *Gangopadhyay* is selection of an Event Entry and not “demand for information and response time for providing the demanded information.” Thus, in claims 98 and 105, react to usage conditions that “include demand for information and response time for providing the demanded information” by “modifying said composite user interface by changing a number of the user interface elements for display by a user computer system in accordance with the usage conditions.” Since *Gangopadhyay* neither teaches nor suggests “modifying said composite user interface by changing a number of the user interface elements for display by a user computer system in accordance with the usage conditions” “wherein the usage conditions include demand for information and response time for providing the demanded

information”, *Gangopadhyay* neither teaches nor suggests claims 98 or 105 or claims dependent thereon.

Claims 110 and 119 recite “combining a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications into composite user interface data.” Table 2 of *Gangopadhyay* provides example associations between entry and subordinate services and between and entry and other preceding or subsequent entries in a Personal Workflow. However, the associations in Table 2 do not represent “user interface elements from the source applications.” *Gangopadhyay* does not teach “combining a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications into composite user interface data” as required by claims 110 and 119.

In the Response to Arguments section, p. 33 of the January 6, 2011 Office Action, the Examiner states that “a “user interface element” is interpreted as a menu option for a service as shown in the “Services” column in Table 2. These services are provided by respective source applications, see [0068], [0084], [0092].” However, claims 110 and 119 require that the **actual** user interface elements themselves are **from the source applications**. Even assuming that the Services in Table 2 are “provided” by respective source applications, providing such services neither teaches nor suggests that the **actual** user interface elements themselves are **from the source applications** and, thus, neither teaches nor suggests “combining a subset of the plurality of user interface elements from the source applications into composite user interface data.”

Accordingly, *Gangopadhyay* does not anticipate claims 110, 119, or claims dependent thereon.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

I.

Claims 101 and 108 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gangopadhyay* U.S. Patent Publication No. US2002/0184402 (referred to herein as (“*Gangopadhyay*”).

Claims 101 and 108 respectively depend from claims 98 and 105. The rejection of claims 98 and 105 in light of *Gangopadhyay* has already been discussed. Accordingly, claims 101 and 108 are not obvious over *Gangopadhyay* for at least the same reasons as claims 98 and 105, respectively.

II.

Claims 112, 113, 115-117, 121, 122 and 124-126 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusterer et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. US2005/0076311A1 (referred to herein as (“*Kusterer*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 112, 113, and 115-117 depend directly or indirectly from claim 110. Claims 121, 122 and 124-126 depend directly or indirectly from claim 119. The rejection of claims 110 and 119 in light of *Kusterer* has already been discussed. Accordingly, claims 112, 113, and 115-117 and claims 121, 122 and 124-126 are not obvious over *Kusterer* for at least the same reasons as claims 110 and 119, respectively.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that on July 6, 2011 this correspondence is being transmitted via the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office’s electronic filing system.

/Kent B. Chambers/

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent B. Chambers/

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839